

the Attorney General is contrary to the Canadian practice and leads directly to a police state. We are not going to have political manipulation of the police force, and we are not going to be pushed into this sort of a thing, by the opposition, by anyone."

The minister's same statement is reported in the *Citizen* and I do not need to repeat it again.

The charges we are faced with tonight are these: First of all, it is alleged we have suggested that the government, either the Prime Minister, the Solicitor General, the Attorney General or any minister concerned with security must monitor the different duties and responsibilities of the police force day to day. Nowhere in the pages of *Hansard*, nowhere in the media or in the press generally has there been any foundation for such a charge.

I ask the Minister of Justice to stand up and show us anywhere in *Hansard* or the parliamentary debates that we have suggested to them monitoring the police work from day to day. In fact what we have said, and as my leader so ably pointed out this afternoon, is that the responsibility for security is under the jurisdiction of the Prime Minister and the two ministers I have mentioned. What we are saying is this, that surely there would be no accountability at all if we are to believe the ministers, which I do not accept. They have never had any accountability. It is not a day-to-day job. They have not done it from week to week or month to month or year to year for eight years. There has been an absence of any accountability, or any responsibility.

An hon. Member: Right on!

Mr. Woolliams: It is not ministerial responsibility we should be talking about tonight, it is ministerial irresponsibility and culpability as far as this matter is concerned. It is a serious matter, because the unity of this country is at stake tonight on security matters, when you realize it is being governed by a group of men and women who have done nothing to make sure the security service of this nation was accountable to the government, and that they take or discharge their responsibilities in that regard.

An hon. Member: Take it seriously.

Mr. Woolliams: So I say, nowhere has the Progressive Conservative party taken a position that the government must necessarily monitor the activities of the RCMP and it is nowhere in the evidence.

Now I turn to the second charge, for which I need to make no apology. It is this red herring. I would say it is a plot by the Prime Minister and those responsible for security in this country to say, "How can we get this onus and responsibility off our shoulders? Because the opposition are interrogating us, and we are covering up and we are not going to give the answers, we will come out with a red herring," and that red herring is the plot set up by the government to say that the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada is standing and

criticizing, and is opposed to one of the great police forces of this world, namely, the RCMP.

Mr. Harquail: That is what you did for two weeks.

Mr. Woolliams: I do not intend to answer my friend and will not name his constituency. I do not want to embarrass him back home. He is embarrassed enough by the policies of this government.

Mr. Harquail: You will not embarrass me. Go ahead.

Mr. Woolliams: I repeat, nowhere can you find that we have offered any criticism of police officers. We say that responsibility should have been that of the Prime Minister and the other ministers. So that when the Minister of Justice makes the charge that we suggested they should monitor the police work from day to day, that is utter nonsense. That is untruthful. When he made that charge in Vancouver, he said he had 400 or 500 clapping Liberals from British Columbia stand up. I can understand why he got a pumpkin pie in the face. It is too bad those seeds were not as hard as rocks.

● (2032)

Mrs. Campagnolo: Shocking!

Mr. Woolliams: I hear the lady minister talking. Does she want to make a speech? The Minister of Justice, because of the position he holds, because of the traditions of this parliament and our due process of law and democracy in this country, has always been accepted as a man like Lapointe, Fulton, and others who stood above politics because their job was to administer the law of Canada and to make sure that law and order were applied to everyone equally. They made sure we were governed by the rule of law, not the rule of people.

I say without hesitation these accusations made by the Minister of Justice are absolutely without parallel in the history of the Canadian parliament. It was scurrilous and unprincipled and, coming from the Minister of Justice, a supposedly non-political figure, it makes it much worse.

Such an attack might be expected from the former solicitor general, the present Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Allmand). As the head of the justice caucus of my party, I say it is unworthy of the Attorney General of Canada to make such a political attack based on facts that are not correct.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: Let us analyse his attack as far as the police are concerned. Like the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), many, many times I have stood in my place to defend citizens in this country in cases in which police officers of that great force, the RCMP, have given evidence. It has been our job to cross-examine them in cases of murder and other serious crimes. Over the years I have found them to be very honest and sincere. Probably only 1 or 2 per cent are involved in security.